

Indiana Mechanical Code Committee Meeting Minutes
Plainfield Guilford Township Public Library
October 17, 2012

Participants:

Cecilia Ernstes-Boxell, Chairperson	cernstes@dhs.in.gov
Ron Brown, Commission Representative	brown@nfsa.org
James Asel	James_Asel@edwardposeapts.com
Steve Bartrom (alternate for Adam Holman)	sbartrom@indy.gov
T.J. Burns	tj.burns@indy.gov
Bill Ciriello	wjcplmbg@aol.com
Darrell Cross	dcross@noblesville.in.us
David Donahue	dcdconsultingllc@gmail.com
Dave Kelly	dmkelly99@koorsen.com
Duane A. Mowrey	mowrey_duane_a@lilly.com
Stan Oman	sroman99@koorsen.com
Thomas Voigt (alternate for Mike Carson)	tvoigt@purdue.edu

Summary

1. Cecilia Ernstes-Boxell called the meeting to order and asked everyone to please sign one of the sign-in sheets.

2. Roll Call was taken. A quorum of the voting members was present.

3. Minutes:

Motion made by Ron Brown; seconded by David Donahue to accept the minutes as presented.
Motion carried. Dan Bates abstained.

At the request of the Committee members the Agenda's order was altered take Code Change proposals first.

4. Discussion of Mechanical Code Change Proposal:

a. Code Change Proposal 5-9; Section 509.2

The proposed code change was to added language to allow an automatic domestic fire suppression system to be used with a Type II hood and to add an exception for Group R-2, apartment homes, hotels and motels. The Committee discussed the number of variances that had been granted to allow the use of an automatic domestic fire suppression system.

The Committee heard testimony that there are some unlisted and unlabeled domestic fire suppression systems available on the market, and there has been some private testing preformed on the systems. The testing revealed a 33% failure rate under actual fire conditions and a 40% failure rate when dry tested. The

unlisted and unlabeled systems usually require two canisters and the estimated cost of two canisters is between \$400.00 and \$800.00.

It was further discussed that there are nationally recognized companies that have listed and labeled domestic fire suppression systems for domestic hoods, but not a Type II hood. It was determined that there is not a fire suppression system listed and labeled for use in a Type II hood. The domestic suppression systems are required to be placed in a residential (domestic) hood, in accordance with the listing and labeling. The domestic hood suppression system is not designed to protect a duct or a plenum. Domestic hood suppression systems are designed to protect the appliance, a typical 4 burner residential range.

Discussion followed about the difference between a Type II hood and a domestic hood. It was discussed that Type II hood are not designed to have a fire suppression system installed. The Committee members discussed the possibility of modifying the proposed code change language regarding the wording "Type II hoods" and/or adding the language "domestic fire suppression system" or combining the proposed code change with the previously accepted code change proposal 5-8.

Code change proposal 5-9 was withdrawn by the proponent.

5. Discussion of the Fuel Gas Code Change Proposal:

a. Code Change Proposal 4-4; 406.7.1.3(3)

The Committee discussed purging of gas lines and how infrequently a combustible gas indicator was used. A combustible gas indicator can be unreliable, due to the calibration of the device not being correct.

It was determined that the average cost of a combustible gas indicator is \$200.00 and several would have to be purchased for the installer to comply with the code. The estimated cost to recalibrate the combustible gas indicator is approximately \$30.00. It was determined, by the Committee that the majority of the time, the inspector is not at the job site when gas lines are purged, therefore the requirement in Section 406.7.1.3 (3) difficult, if not impossible to enforce. Combustible gas indicators are generally used for leak detection, and not for purging the system.

Motion made by Ron Brown; seconded by David Donahue to accept the proposal to delete the requirement of using a combustible gas indicator when purging a gas line. Motion carried.

b. Code Change Proposal 4-5; 406.7.2.1(4)

During the discussion the Committee determined that this section contained the same requirement as Code Change Proposal 4-4. The Committee agreed that the last sentence in item #4, needed to be retained.

Motion made by Darrell Cross to accept the proposed code change as amended; David Donahue seconded. Motion carried.

6. Review of Mechanical Code Draft Proposed Rule.

A review of the draft rule allowed Committee members to ask questions and correct errors, or omissions.

Question was asked why the Scope section did not list the appropriate NFPA standards for fire or explosion. The Committee determined that the language in the draft rule is the same as the current rule.

Question about why the definition chapter, Chapter 2, contained two definitions for each code. Example used were “Building Code” and it said to “see the Indiana Building Code”, and the Indiana Building Code gave the definition. The Committee asked if the definition contained in the “Indiana Building Code”, could be inserted in the definition for “Building Code”, instead of “see the Indiana Building Code.

The Commission further questioned why the definition of Townhouse was in the Mechanical Code as well as the Fuel Gas.

The Committee members listed the corrections that needed to be made to the draft rule and they are as follows:

Page 4

Section 3, Chapter 2

(b) (19) Definition of Indiana Mechanical Code. The words “MEANS THE”, convert to lower case.

Page 6.

Section 4, Chapter 3

(d) Section 301.7. It was determined that (c) Section 301.4 should be changed to Section 301.7 and (d) Section 301.7 should be changed to Section 310.8

(e) Section 301.9, Item 4. In reviewing the text of Section 301.9 (4), it was determined that the word “approval” was not in the text. Section 301.9 in the 2012 IMC was rewritten. The Committee agreed that (e) Section 301.9 is to be deleted and the remainder of Section 4 to be re-lettered.

Page 7

Section 6, Chapter 5

(f) Section 507.1, Exception 2. It was determined that the word “paragraph” should be “sentence”.

(h) Section 507.2.1, Exception. The number “3” after the “m” should be written as a superscript 3 and not a subscript 3.

(g) Section 507.1.1. Is really Section 507.11 and the word “sentence” should be written as “paragraph”.

Stan Oman brought to the Committees attention that a new fiber mesh filter product that has been listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1046-2011. NFPA 96-2011 expanded the definition of Mesh filters. The UL 1046 listing for mesh filters, are allowed to be used in conjunction with listed filter, and baffled. The mesh filter is made of a fiber material. The fibers in the mesh filter are designed to “catch” the grease, which creates a cleaner hood. Currently two hood manufacturers are allowing the mesh filters to be used in the product. The Committee agreed there was insufficient information available on the mesh filters and the proposed amendment would be retained as written.

Section 7, Chapter 6

(a) Section 602.1. A Committee member stated he would like to discuss the accepted code change proposal with the proponent. The Committee member is unclear what the proponent is attempting to achieve.

(a) Section 602.1 item 3. Gas shut off should be readily accessible. Should not have to use tools or remove grills or grates to obtain access to the shut off valve. The word “readily” was inserted before “accessible. It was noted that Section 409.5.1 (IFGC) states that the shut off valve shall be installed in the same room with the appliance. If the room in question is used as plenum, a shut off valve is not allowed to be installed. The only way the shut off valve can be in the same room as the appliance, is if there is a ducted return air. Currently the proposed code change will be retained as shown in the draft rule.

(b) Section 607.5.4, the number “2” should be inserted after “exception”.

(c) Section 607.5.5 item 2. The word “substitution” is misspelled.

Page 8

Section 9, Chapter 9

Section 917.4; suggestion was made to strike the words “deep-fat fryer”, and insert the word “cooking media” since “fats” are no long used in the frying process. Rational given, NFPA 10, Standard for Fire Extinguishers uses the words “cooking media”. Committee members verified that the 2012 IMC uses the word “deep-fat fryer” in the definitions. The proposed amendment will be retained as written.

Section 11, Chapter 11

The Committee noted that the ICC errata for Section 1105.6.3, which change the number of air changes per hour from 20 to 30 did not appear in the draft rule.

Duane Mowery stated that the amendment he proposed and the committee accepted for Section 1106.5 did not appear in the draft rule.

Cecilia stated that the ASME standard that the Committee accepted into the IMC needed to be adopted as a primarily incorporated document and asked the Committee who would be able to provide a copy of the standards. It was determined that Bob Hall from Viega was the proponent of the proposed code change and Frank Bruggner attended the meeting for Viega, so maybe they could provide a copy of the ASME standard.

7. Memo from Mara Snyder to Commission Members; John Hawkins, Matt Mitchell and Ron Brown:

Ron Brown stated the memo from Mara Snyder discussed the possibility of conflicts between the four codes. Ron Brown stated that the committees may have to re-convene and attempt to reach a favorable resolution between the conflicts. If a resolution could not be agreed upon by the Committees, then the Commission could hear arguments as to why a particular committee's version of the code should be retained.

Darrell Cross suggested that the Committee's as well as the Commission follow ICC's lead on resolving the conflicts. Darrell Cross stated that in the front of the code books ICC published a clarification explaining the letter designation that appears in brackets [], preceding the section number, is the committee that assigned the responsibility for the development of that particular portion of the code. Darrell Cross further stated that the promulgating committee should be the deciding factor.

It was the consensus of the Committee members that Darrell Cross was correct; however, this did not seem to be the consensus of the other committees.

8. Review of the Fuel Gas Code:

The Committee completed its review of Chapters 6 and 7 for new code requirements to determine if a fiscal impact would be incurred.

The following sections in Chapter 6 did not create a fiscal impact and would be retained as written: 614.6, 614.6.1, 614.6.2, 614.6.4, 614.6.5, 614.6.5.2, Table 614.6.5.1, 614.6.7, 614.8, 616.1, 616.2, 618.5, 618.6, 618.7, 620.6, 623.7, 630.3, and 636.1.

The following sections in Chapter 6 create a fiscal impact by way of an increase, which includes the cost of the product plus the labor cost: 614.6.3 - \$3.50 per nailing shield, and 614.6.6 per tag.

The following sections in Chapter 6 create a fiscal impact by way of a decrease: 614.6.5.1 price per foot, and 618.4 items 6 and 7.

The following sections in Chapter 7 did not create a fiscal impact and will be retained as written: Section 703.1 and 704.1.2.3.5.

9. Review of the Indiana Amendments to the Fuel Gas Code:

The Committee agreed that the following Indiana amendments would not be carried forward into the proposed draft rule for the 2012 Fuel Gas Code: Sections 305.4 (305.4 – 2012), 404.1 (404.1 – 2012), 404.6 (404.8 – 2012), 404.6.1 (404.8.1 – 2012), 404.6.2 (404.8.2 – 2012), 404.8 (404.11 – 2012), 404.11 (404.14 – 2012), 404.11.1 (404.14.1 – 2012), 404.11.2 (404.14.2 – 2012), 404.14.2 (404.17.2 – 2012), 408.4 (408.4 – 2012), 409.5.1 (409.5.1 – 2012), 409.5.2 (409.5.2 – 2012), 409.6 (409.6 – 2012), 410.3.1 (410.3.1 – 2012), 411.1.5 (411.1.6 – 2012), 501.4, (501.4 – 2012) 501.15.4 (501.15.4 – 2012), 501.15.4.1 (501.15.4.1 – 2012), and 704.1.2.3.5 (704.1.2.3.5 – 2012) .

The following Indiana amendments will be carried forward into the proposed draft rule: 412, 413 and Section 8.

10 Next Meeting:

The third Wednesday in November is the day before Thanksgiving and the Committee agreed, by consensus, to change the meeting to November 14, 2012 at the Plainfield – Guilford Public Library in Plainfield at 9:10 a.m.

There being no further business before the Committee, Ron Brown made a motion to adjourn; seconded David Donahue. Motion carried.